

*DREE Grant*

question to the minister at a meeting of the Standing Committee on Regional Development on March 23. The application made for the construction of a warehouse in Quebec City was quite different from that made for the construction of a plant in Melfort, Saskatchewan. The financial assistance requested was not the same and the financial statements submitted for the Quebec project were quite different from those submitted for the Melfort project. If ever the hon. member wants more information, I would be quite pleased to get his questions in writing, and we could answer him in writing pointing out the significant differences between both projects.

[English]

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West):** Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to say that we support the motion of the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski). We would like to see this correspondence produced, but likely for entirely different reasons than those of the hon. member. We support the idea of a rapeseed crushing plant located in Melfort or somewhere in that area. There is no argument about that, but we part company with the hon. member and with the government when we say that not one nickel should go to an outfit like Cargill Grain. The government, in providing funds to Cargill in Quebec or anywhere else, is totally wrong. The government and FIRA, the toothless tiger for Canadian economic independence and sovereignty, should never have allowed Cargill Grain into the country in the first place when National Grain was bought out.

I do not know whether the hon. member for Mackenzie realizes that representatives of the outfit which he supports have been in court, fined and even jailed repeatedly in the United States. This is an outfit which was party to short-weighting American grain aid to starving people in Bangladesh and India by eight million bushels; this is the kind of outfit he is supporting.

I made careful note of the hon. member's remarks when he said that a grant to CSP, the co-operative movement in Saskatchewan, instead of to Cargill would be unfair competition. I will make sure that all co-operative and pool members in the hon. member's riding hear about that. I hope he is extra careful when he checks *Hansard* later this day. Is it unfair competition if a grant is paid to a company which is owned, controlled, developed, and paid for by grain producers themselves rather than to a multinational corporation in the United States? In fact, Cargill is the largest in the world. It has hundreds of millions of dollars to play with on any given day of the month. Are the people of Canada supposed to give a grant to Cargill, when its first objective is to make all the bucks it can off grain producers, particularly rapeseed producers in Canada? Its next objective is to destroy orderly marketing, the co-operative movement and the Canadian Wheat Board. It wants a free and open market; that is its next objective. Cargill is the outfit which indicated that one of the reasons it would not go ahead with the rapeseed crushing plant in Melfort was the Crow rate.

I presume the hon. member, by pleading on behalf of Cargill, fully supports the fact that rapeseed producers in his riding will be receiving \$20 less per tonne by 1986-87. Also I presume his pleading on behalf of Cargill means that he agrees rapeseed producers should receive \$20 per tonne less. I hope he tells that to rapeseed producers of his constituency and to those in the entire area of Saskatchewan which produces rapeseed.

We do not necessarily need another rapeseed crushing mill at the moment. In its report of January 1982, the rapeseed industry projected that by 1985 the domestic and export demands for rapeseed oil would increase by something in the order of 150,000 tonnes, that the demand for meal would increase in the order of about 200,000 tonnes, and that we would need one or more additional rapeseed crushing plants. Surely to goodness Canadian taxpayers, rapeseed producers and flaxseed producers of Saskatchewan should not be called upon to put up money for a multinational grain corporation. Another of Cargill's objectives is to ensure that United States grain producers get priority over the grain producers in Canada with which Cargill might deal or in any other country of the world.

The hon. member also talked about 300-mile hauls for rapeseed. Where was he when his party was in power for nine months, when the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) was in charge of a committee on branch line abandonment and the line from Gronlid to Melfort was abandoned? Where was he? Did he appear before the CTC with a brief?

• (1740)

**Mr. Korchinski:** I made a submission.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Did he persuade the hon. member for Moose Jaw to keep that line? The grain producers in Gronlid now have to haul their grain another 20 miles.

**Mr. Korchinski:** I made a submission.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Who did you make it to and what luck did you have with your own government?

I am surprised that the hon. member would go to bat for an outfit like Cargill when we need additional rapeseed crushing capacity in western Canada. It is our preference that it be in the hands and ownership of grain producers themselves, whether it is rapeseed, flaxseed or any other grain.

Second, I had hoped that the hon. member for Mackenzie would be in support of the recommendations of the Hall Commission. The courts ruled a long time ago that rapeseed was a grain, thereby making it eligible for the statutory grain rate, the Crow rate. Meal was subsequently considered a product because the statutory rates apply to grain and grain products. Since rapeseed is grain, rapeseed meal is a grain product and the Crow rate applies to rapeseed meal. Mysteriously, the statutory rate does not apply to rapeseed oil which is a severe handicap to the crushers in western Canada. In fact, it is no wonder that the Japanese want to buy only rapeseed, because they get the benefit of the Crow rate and then process